UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,137	10/695,137 10/28/2003 Larry		555255012611	6439
89441 Jones Day (RIM	7590 01/21/201 1) - 2N	EXAMINER		
North Point		PAUL, DISLER		
901 Lakeside A Cleveland, OH		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/21/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dlpejeau@jonesday.com portfolioprosecution@rim.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/695,137	HAWKER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	DISLER PAUL	2614	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
 THE REPLY FILED 17 December 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complian time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, af otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing dat	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ctension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply oric r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	
	but prior to the data of filing a briat	will not be entered b	0001100
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further contains 			ecause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE bek		TE Delow),	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) $oxdot$ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.75. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar			
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			•
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Devona E. Faulk/ Primary Examiner, A rt U	Init 2614	

Continuation of 13. Other: the applicant argument has been further considered and is non-persuasisve for the same reason as set forth in the last office action.

Furthermore; In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 US PQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

in that case, while, Yoo did disclsoe of the transition element wherin "switching from the handset mode of operation to the handsfree mode of operation while processing the incoming call (par [0006; 0009]).

thus, in regard to the independent claim 1, the combined teaching of Schimdt and Kanevsky et al. and Yoo as a whole, furthe disclose of the concept of operatin the operating the mobile device in the hands-free mode of operation according to the safe volume profile so as to protect the hearing of the mobile device user in case the mobile device is still held in close proximity to the user's ear when the mobile device transitions from the handset mode of operation to the handsfree mode of operation (Kanevsky; fig.1 (100); fig.2 (202,204); par [0006; 0018]/the device to be used with a safe volume profile according to specific desired modes of operations which include the handfree and handset modes selection as taught by YOO).

the same argument is aplied to independent claim 41, since Schmidt already disclsoe of such: "swiitching the mobile manually from the handset moe to the hands-free mode".

However,

But, Kanevsky et al. disclose of a method of method comprising: initially limitming the volume to a preset initial level when the mobile device as being switched from the different modes of operations (fig.2 (202,204,210); par [0018-0019; 0022; 0025]/based on the different modes as selected as being used according, to the specific users habits, the device initial limit the volume to a certain initial level threshold) so as to prevent harmful sound level from damaging a user's hearing according to the specific mode of operation.